

Submitted
6/23/2003 11:29 AM

Tennessee Department of Education Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook January 31, 2003

**for State Grants under Title IX, Part C, Section 9302 of the Elementary and
Secondary Education Act (Public Law 107-110)**



**U. S. Department of Education
Office of Elementary and Secondary Education
Washington, D.C. 20202**

Tennessee Department of Education
Submitted
6/23/2003 11:29 AM

Instructions for Completing Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook

By January 31, 2003, States must complete and submit to the Department this Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook. We understand that some of the critical elements for the key principles may still be under consideration and may not yet be final State policy by the January 31 due date. States that do not have final approval for some of these elements or that have not finalized a decision on these elements by January 31 should, when completing the Workbook, indicate the status of each element which is not yet official State policy and provide the anticipated date by which the proposed policy will become effective. In each of these cases, States must include a timeline of steps to complete to ensure that such elements are in place by May 1, 2003, and implemented during the 2002-2003 school year. By no later than May 1, 2003, States must submit to the Department final information for all sections of the Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook.

Transmittal Instructions

To expedite the receipt of this Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook, please send your submission via the Internet as a .doc file, pdf file, rtf or .txt file or provide the URL for the site where your submission is posted on the Internet. Send electronic submissions to conapp@ed.gov.

A State that submits only a paper submission should mail the submission by express courier to:

Celia Sims
U.S. Department of Education
450 Maryland Ave., SW
Room 3W300
Washington, D.C. 20202-6450
(202) 451-0113

PART I: Summary of Required Elements for State Accountability Systems

Instructions

The following chart is an overview of States' implementation of the critical elements required for approval of their State accountability systems. States must provide detailed implementation information for each of these elements in Part II of this Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook.

For each of the elements listed in the following chart, States should indicate the current implementation status in their State using the following legend:

- F:** State has a final policy, approved by all the required entities in the State (e.g., State Board of Education, State Legislature), for implementing this element in its accountability system.
- P:** State has a proposed policy for implementing this element in its accountability system, but must still receive approval by required entities in the State (e.g., State Board of Education, State Legislature).
- W:** State is still working on formulating a policy to implement this element in its accountability system.

**Summary of Implementation Status for Required Elements of
State Accountability Systems**

Status	State Accountability System Element
<u>Principle 1: All Schools</u>	
P	1.1 Accountability system includes <i>all schools and districts in the state</i> .
P	1.2 Accountability system holds <i>all schools to the same criteria</i> .
P	1.3 Accountability system incorporates the <i>academic achievement standards</i> .
P	1.4 Accountability system provides <i>information in a timely manner</i> .
F	1.5 Accountability system includes <i>report cards</i> .
P	1.6 Accountability system includes <i>rewards and sanctions</i> .
<u>Principle 2: All Students</u>	
P	2.1 The accountability system includes <i>all students</i>
P	2.2 The accountability system has a consistent definition of <i>full academic year</i> .
P	2.3 The accountability system properly includes <i>mobile students</i> .
<u>Principle 3: Method of AYP Determinations</u>	
P	3.1 Accountability system expects <i>all student subgroups, public schools, and LEAs to reach proficiency by 2013-14</i> .
P	3.2 Accountability system has a method for determining whether <i>student subgroups, public schools, and LEAs made adequate yearly progress</i> .
W	3.2a Accountability system establishes a <i>starting point</i> .
W	3.2b Accountability system establishes <i>statewide annual measurable objectives</i> .
W	3.2c Accountability system establishes <i>intermediate goals</i> .
<u>Principle 4: Annual Decisions</u>	
F	4.1 The accountability system <i>determines annually the progress</i> of schools and districts.

STATUS Legend:

F – Final state policy

P – Proposed policy, awaiting State approval

W – Working to formulate policy

Tennessee Department of Education

Submitted

6/23/2003 11:29 AM

Principle 5: Subgroup Accountability

P	5.1	The accountability system <i>includes all the required student subgroups</i> .
P	5.2	The accountability system holds <i>schools and LEAs accountable for the progress of student subgroups</i> .
P	5.3	The accountability system includes <i>students with disabilities</i> .
P	5.4	The accountability system includes <i>limited English proficient students</i> .
P	5.5	The State has determined the minimum number of students sufficient to yield statistically reliable information for each purpose for which disaggregated data are used.
P	5.6	The State has strategies to protect the privacy of individual students in reporting achievement results and in determining whether schools and LEAs are making adequate yearly progress on the basis of disaggregated subgroups.

Principle 6: Based on Academic Assessments

F	6.1	Accountability system is based <i>primarily on academic assessments</i> .
---	-----	---

Principle 7: Additional Indicators

P	7.1	Accountability system includes <i>graduation rate for high schools</i> .
P	7.2	Accountability system includes an <i>additional academic indicator for elementary and middle schools</i> .
P	7.3	Additional indicators are valid and reliable.

Principle 8: Separate Decisions for Reading/Language Arts and Mathematics

P	8.1	Accountability system holds students, schools and districts separately accountable for <i>reading/language arts and mathematics</i> .
---	-----	---

Principle 9: System Validity and Reliability

P	9.1	Accountability system produces <i>reliable decisions</i> .
P	9.2	Accountability system produces <i>valid decisions</i> .
W	9.3	State has a plan for addressing <i>changes in assessment and student population</i> .

Principle 10: Participation Rate

P	10.1	Accountability system has a means for calculating the <i>rate of participation</i> in the statewide assessment.
P	10.2	Accountability system has a means for <i>applying the 95% assessment criteria to student subgroups and small schools</i> .

STATUS Legend:

F – Final policy

P – Proposed Policy, awaiting State approval W– Working to formulate policy

Tennessee Department of Education

Submitted

6/23/2003 11:29 AM

PART II: State Response and Activities for Meeting State Accountability System Requirements

Instructions

In Part II of this Workbook, States are to provide detailed information for each of the critical elements required for State accountability systems. States should answer the questions asked about each of the critical elements in the State's accountability system. States that do not have final approval for any of these elements or that have not finalized a decision on these elements by January 31, 2003, should, when completing this section of the Workbook, indicate the status of each element that is not yet official State policy and provide the anticipated date by which the proposed policy will become effective. In each of these cases, States must include a timeline of steps to complete to ensure that such elements are in place by May 1, 2003, and implemented during the 2002-2003 school year. By no later than May 1, 2003, States must submit to the Department final information for all sections of the Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook.

PRINCIPLE 1. A single statewide Accountability System applied to all public schools and LEAs.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>1.1 How does the State Accountability System include every public school and LEA in the State?</p>	<p>Every public school and LEA is required to make adequate yearly progress and is included in the State Accountability System.</p> <p>State has a definition of “public school” and “LEA” for AYP accountability purposes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The State Accountability System produces AYP decisions for all public schools, including public schools with variant grade configurations (e.g., K-12), public schools that serve special populations (e.g., alternative public schools, juvenile institutions, state public schools for the blind) and public charter schools. It also holds accountable public schools with no grades assessed (e.g., K-2). 	<p>A public school or LEA is not required to make adequate yearly progress and is not included in the State Accountability System.</p> <p>State policy systematically excludes certain public schools and/or LEAs.</p>

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

Tennessee will hold every public school and LEA in the state accountable, including charter schools. Only K-2 schools do not participate in the standardized state assessment system. These schools will be held accountable based on the performance of their receiving schools. T.C.A.49-1-602, enacted during the 2002 legislative session, amended the Education Improvement Act to form a single accountability system for all Tennessee public schools. All schools, Title I and non-Title I, will be held to the same Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) measures. The State will identify their progress in meeting those objectives by the required disaggregated subgroup populations on the State's report card.

In addition, during the 2002 legislative session, Tennessee enacted its first charter school legislation. This legislation specifically requires charter schools to meet adequate yearly progress measures or face the revocation of their charters.

T.C.A. 49-1-602 requires the Department of Education to present to the State Board of Education by September 1 the list of schools identified as not meeting AYP objectives and identified in a sanction category.

The State will assist LEAs to understand how the accountability system works by providing written guidance and holding special conferences and workshops. This information will include how the State calculates participation, attendance, and graduation rates.

Links to Supporting Evidence:

<http://198.187.128.12/tennessee/lpext.dll?f=templates&fn=fs-main.htm&2.0>

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS
1.2 How are all public schools and LEAs held to the same criteria when making an AYP determination?	All public schools and LEAs are systematically judged on the basis of the same criteria when making an AYP determination. If applicable, the AYP definition is integrated into the State Accountability System.	Some public schools and LEAs are systematically judged on the basis of alternate criteria when making an AYP determination.

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

All public schools, including charter schools, and LEAs are judged on the basis of the same AYP criteria for accountability purposes. Schools that contain grade configurations that cross both AYP levels (elementary/middle and secondary) will be held accountable for meeting AYP for both levels. Determination of the accountability status will be made for both levels in the school. The following types of schools will be held accountable in the manner described below:

K-2 Schools – The State will base their status on their receiving schools' AYP determination;

Alternative Schools - Students in alternative schools will have their performance data assigned to the alternative schools they are attending;

Local Special Schools – Students in special schools at the local level will have their performance data assigned to the schools they are attending;

Special Classrooms within Schools – Students in special classrooms within schools designed to meet special needs and serve students from other schools, such as specialized special education classes, will have their performance data assigned to the schools they are attending;

State Special Schools – Students in special schools at the state level, such as Tennessee School for the Blind, will have their performance data assigned to the state;

Small Schools – Schools will fewer than an N of 45 for all students for the most current year, which account for only about 3% of the schools in the state, will be defined as a small school and a 95% confidence band will be utilized to determine AYP for that year based on the “N” count that the school has. In addition, the State will study over the next year whether the confidence interval, some form of averaging the “Ns” over several years, or some other approach might result in a more reliable and valid determination of the performance of our small schools; and,

New Schools – Students in newly opened schools, including newly opened charter schools, will have their performance data assigned to the new school they are attending. The first year a new school is open, the State will only report the results of the assessments. The second year the State will make its initial adequate yearly progress (AYP) determination for the new school. The third year the new school is open will be the first year that the new school could potentially be identified for school improvement.

In Tennessee, students in court-ordered facilities are by law the direct responsibility of the Department of Children's Services rather than the Department of Education and cannot be included in public school accountability determinations.

Results from Tennessee's Value-Added Assessment System (TVAAS) will be used for four purposes:

- 1) to help schools and districts improve their educational programs for all students;
- 2) to reward schools and districts that meet adequate yearly progress and demonstrate high value-added effects;
- 3) to determine the level and kind of technical assistance provided to schools and districts that are identified in school improvement status; and
- 4) to determine the number, the kind, and the level of interventions selected by the State to improve schools or districts identified in school improvement status as required under No Child Left Behind (NCLB) and the Education Improvement Act.

Tennessee Department of Education

Submitted

6/23/2003 11:29 AM

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>1.3 Does the State have, at a minimum, a definition of <i>basic</i>, <i>proficient</i> and <i>advanced</i> student achievement levels in reading/language arts and mathematics?</p>	<p>State has defined three levels of student achievement: <i>basic</i>, <i>proficient</i> and <i>advanced</i>.¹</p> <p>Student achievement levels of <i>proficient</i> and <i>advanced</i> determine how well students are mastering the materials in the State's academic content standards; and the <i>basic</i> level of achievement provides complete information about the progress of lower-achieving students toward mastering the <i>proficient</i> and <i>advanced</i> levels.</p>	<p>Standards do not meet the legislated requirements.</p>

¹ System of State achievement standards will be reviewed by the Standards and Assessments Peer Review. The Accountability Peer Review will determine that achievement levels are used in determining AYP.

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

Tennessee's rigorous content and academic content standards describe three levels of performance: below proficient, proficient, and advanced. These standards were adopted by the State Board of Education in 2001. Standard setting for the high school Gateway mathematics, English, and science exams were determined in Summer 2002.

The following timeline delineates future activities:

Spring 2003 – Implementation of State's standards-based assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics in grades 3, 5, and 8

Summer 2003 – Standard setting for standards-based assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics in grades 3, 5, and 8

Spring 2004 – Implementation of State's standards-based assessments in reading/language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies in grades 3-8

Summer 2004 – Standard setting for standards-based assessment in reading/language arts and mathematics in grades 4, 6, and 7, and standard setting for standards-based assessment in science and social studies grades 3-8.

Links to Supporting Evidence:

<http://www.state.tn.us/education/ci/cicurassessedstandards.htm>

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>1.4 How does the State provide accountability and adequate yearly progress decisions and information in a timely manner?</p>	<p>State provides decisions about adequate yearly progress in time for LEAs to implement the required provisions before the beginning of the next academic year.</p> <p>State allows enough time to notify parents about public school choice or supplemental educational service options, time for parents to make an informed decision, and time to implement public school choice and supplemental educational services.</p>	<p>Timeline does not provide sufficient time for LEAs to fulfill their responsibilities before the beginning of the next academic year.</p>

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

The testing schedule for assessments included in the State's accountability system is as follows:

February - Writing Assessments (grades 5, 8, and 11);

April – Norm-referenced and standards-based assessments - grades 3-8; and,

May (and December for schools with block scheduling) – Gateway English and Math.

TCAP summary results and initial AYP determinations will be accomplished by August 1. The State and the affected district will notify parents of their options for public school choice and supplemental services for identified schools before the first day of school. This will be done by notifying the public through such mediums as the media and posting the information on the State and district web site. Identified schools will follow this initial public notification by sending letters home with students on the first day of school. All schools identified in any school improvement status will be notified by August 1 so that they may review their data and have an opportunity to appeal the decision for “statistical or other substantive reasons.” The Department expects very few appeals and only those schools that 1) have indicated that they plan to appeal the decision for “statistical or other substantive reasons” and 2) would not have to offer public school choice and/or supplemental services if the appeal were successful would be allowed to inform parents that the implementation of these options would only occur if the school lost its appeal. This will happen by September 1, the date the Department is mandated to present its list of identified schools to the State Board of Education for approval as required by state law.

Schools that are identified will provide parents with the opportunity to enroll their child in another public school that is not identified for improvement. Schools in their second year of school improvement will also provide opportunities for supplemental services to the low-income lowest achieving students in the school.

Links to Supporting Data:

<http://state.tn.us/education/tstable02.htm>

<http://198.187.128.12/tennessee/lpext.dll?f=templates&fn=fs-main.htm&2.0>

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>1.5 Does the State Accountability System produce an annual State Report Card?</p>	<p>The State Report Card includes all the required data elements [see Appendix A for the list of required data elements].</p> <p>The State Report Card is available to the public at the beginning of the academic year.</p> <p>The State Report Card is accessible in languages of major populations in the State, to the extent available.</p> <p>Assessment results and other academic indicators (including graduation rates) are reported by student subgroups</p>	<p>The State Report Card does not include all the required data elements.</p> <p>The State Report Card is not available to the public.</p>

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

Tennessee has had state report cards for quite a few years. In the 2001 legislative session, Tennessee enacted legislation (TCA 49-1-211(c)) which required data to be disaggregated before being publicly released. For school year 2002-2003, the State provided statewide, district, and school level information on its state report card website. The Department will review the current report card to ensure that all required NCLB components are included.

The Department is in the process of revising the current report card to include the required components. The Department will provide the U.S. Department of Education a draft of the revised report card when it is available. On this revised report card, the Department will include the required information about “highly qualified” teachers.

Links to Supporting Evidence:

<http://www.k-12.state.tn.us/rptcrd02/>

<http://198.187.128.12/tennessee/lpext.dll?f=templates&fn=fs-main.htm&2.0>

<http://www.state.tn.us/education/mnclb.htm>

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>1.6 How does the State Accountability System include rewards and sanctions for public schools and LEAs?²</p>	<p>State uses one or more types of rewards and sanctions, where the criteria are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Set by the State; • Based on adequate yearly progress decisions; and, • Applied uniformly across public schools and LEAs. 	<p>State does not implement rewards or sanctions for public schools and LEAs based on adequate yearly progress.</p>

² The state must provide rewards and sanctions for all public schools and LEAs for making adequate yearly progress, except that the State is not required to hold schools and LEAs not receiving Title I funds to the requirements of section 1116 of NCLB [§200.12(b)(45)].

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

As a result of its unified single accountability system, the State proposes to recognize two groups of schools: those that have exceeded their AYP for two or more years and those that significantly close the achievement gap between their subgroup student populations. Both groups of schools must also demonstrate strong value-added scores. These schools will be recognized on the State's report card site. The State will utilize the same recognition process for LEAs that significantly close the achievement gap and/or exceed their AYP for two or more consecutive years.

From the two groups of recognized schools, two Title I schools will be recognized to represent Tennessee nationally for having made the greatest gains in closing the achievement gap and/or exceeding their AYP for two or more consecutive years. These schools will be recognized at State Title I conferences and representatives from the schools will be sent to the National Title I conference to represent the State. Representatives from these schools will be utilized as part of the State's School Support System.

Because of its unified single accountability system, both Title I and non-Title I schools, and LEAs will face similar sanctions. All state schools enter the same sanction category in year 2 of school improvement (or "on notice" by state law). Title I schools face additional sanctions at each category of school improvement. These requirements are summarized in Attachment A.

Links to Supporting Evidence:

<http://198.187.128.12/tennessee/lpext.dll?f=templates&fn=fs-main.htm&2.0>

PRINCIPLE 2. All students are included in the State Accountability System.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS
2.1 How does the State Accountability System include all students in the State?	<p>All students in the State are included in the State Accountability System.</p> <p>The definitions of “public school” and “LEA” account for all students enrolled in the public school district, regardless of program or type of public school.</p>	<p>Public school students exist in the State for whom the State Accountability System makes no provision.</p>

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

All students enrolled in Tennessee public schools are required to participate in the Tennessee Comprehensive Assessment Program. Most students participate by taking the standard form of TCAP assessments. Fewer than .5% of students participated in the TCAP Alternative Assessments in Spring 2002. LEAs arrange for make up sessions when students are absent on the testing dates.

Beginning with Spring 2003, answer sheets for all students will be required to be returned to the State for processing. For students that have not been tested, the school will be required to identify the reason. The answer sheet for all students, including those that did not participate, will be coded with the required demographic information so that the State may calculate the participation rate for all students and all required subgroups.

The State will calculate the participation rate by dividing the number of attempted tests by the number of submitted test answer sheets. An attempted test will be one in which the student attempted at least to answer some question on these required subtests of the TCAP: reading, language arts, writing, and/or math. The State will clearly communicate to LEAs in written guidance as well as during conferences and workshops that every child must attempt the test. To check for the reliability of this system, the State will randomly audit schools' submitted answer sheets against the schools' reported enrollment for the first day of testing.

Links to Supporting Evidence:

<http://www.state.tn.us/education/03tsadminmanual%20.pdf>

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS
2.2 How does the State define “full academic year” for identifying students in AYP decisions?	<p>The State has a definition of “full academic year” for determining which students are to be included in decisions about AYP.</p> <p>The definition of full academic year is consistent and applied statewide.</p>	<p>LEAs have varying definitions of “full academic year.”</p> <p>The State’s definition excludes students who must transfer from one district to another as they advance to the next grade.</p> <p>The definition of full academic year is not applied consistently.</p>

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

A full academic year will be defined as continuous enrollment in a school, district, or the state from at least one day of the first reporting period (consisting of the first 20 days of the school year and reported October 31) until test administration. This information will be required to be coded on the students' test answer sheets. In cases in which students are absent because of suspension, the suspended students will still be considered enrolled in the school.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>2.3 How does the State Accountability System determine which students have attended the same public school and/or LEA for a full academic year?</p>	<p>State holds public schools accountable for students who were enrolled at the same public school for a full academic year.</p> <p>State holds LEAs accountable for students who transfer during the full academic year from one public school within the district to another public school within the district.</p>	<p>State definition requires students to attend the same public school for more than a full academic year to be included in public school accountability.</p> <p>State definition requires students to attend school in the same district for more than a full academic year to be included in district accountability.</p> <p>State holds public schools accountable for students who have not attended the same public school for a full academic year.</p>

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

The TCAP answer sheet will identify students who have been in the school, district, or state continuously for less than a full academic year. When the State analyzes test results for the purposes of accountability, only students who were in the school, district, or state will be included in the appropriate category(s).

Please see the State's response to Critical Element 2.2 for the definition of a full academic year.

PRINCIPLE 3. State definition of AYP is based on expectations for growth in student achievement that is continuous and substantial, such that all students are proficient in reading/language arts and mathematics no later than 2013-2014.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>3.1 How does the State's definition of adequate yearly progress require all students to be proficient in reading/language arts and mathematics by the 2013-2014 academic year?</p>	<p>The State has a timeline for ensuring that all students will meet or exceed the State's proficient level of academic achievement in reading/language arts³ and mathematics, not later than 2013-2014.</p>	<p>State definition does not require all students to achieve proficiency by 2013-2014.</p> <p>State extends the timeline past the 2013-2014 academic year.</p>

³ If the state has separate assessments to cover its language arts standards (e.g., reading and writing), the State must create a method to include scores from all the relevant assessments.

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

Starting points, intermediate goals, and annual measurable objectives will be set separately for reading/language arts and math in Summer 2003 such that they yield 100% proficiency for the State, LEAs, schools, and all required subgroups by 2013-14. Using the starting points for each content area and grade span, the amount of annual growth necessary to reach 100% within the 11 year period will be calculated. Separate starting points, intermediate goals, and annual measurable objectives for math and reading/language arts will be established for two levels: elementary-middle and high school levels. Reading/language arts will be determined in the following manner:

Grades 3 – 8 – Combining the results of the TCAP reading, language arts, and writing assessments (grades 5 and 8)

High School – Combining the results of the Gateway English and writing assessment (Grade 11)

The State has defined proficient on the Writing Assessments as scoring a 4 or above (out of 6) on the evaluation rubric.

All schools, Title I and non-Title I, and LEAs which fail to meet annual measurable objectives in the same content area (math and reading/language arts) or the additional indicator (attendance rate or graduation rate) for two consecutive years will be identified as in improvement status or move to the next improvement category.

To meet adequate yearly progress for either math or reading/language arts, a school or district must meet these two requirements:

1. 95% participation rate for that content area on the state assessment for all students and for each required subgroup; and,
2. the annual measurable objective for that content area for all students and for each required subgroup.

Links to Supporting Evidence:

<http://www.state.tn.us/education/tswritingb.htm>

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>3.2 How does the State Accountability System determine whether each student subgroup, public school and LEA makes AYP?</p>	<p>For a public school and LEA to make adequate yearly progress, each student subgroup must meet or exceed the State annual measurable objectives, each student subgroup must have at least a 95% participation rate in the statewide assessments, and the school must meet the State's requirement for other academic indicators.</p> <p>However, if in any particular year the student subgroup does not meet those annual measurable objectives, the public school or LEA may be considered to have made AYP, if the percentage of students in that group who did not meet or exceed the proficient level of academic achievement on the State assessments for that year decreased by 10% of that percentage from the preceding public school year; that group made progress on one or more of the State's academic indicators; and that group had at least 95% participation rate on the statewide assessment.</p>	<p>State uses different method for calculating how public schools and LEAs make AYP.</p>

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------------------

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

In order for schools and LEAs to make AYP, each must:

- Achieve an annual 95% participation rate in the required TCAP accountability tests as a whole and for each student subgroup;
- Reach AYP objectives in reading/language arts and math as a whole and for each student subgroup; and,
- Reach annual measurable objectives in the additional indicator for all students.

Reading/language arts objectives will be determined at the high school level by combining the results from students' Gateway English exam and the writing assessment (using three-year averages when available). At the elementary-middle school level, the objective will be determined by combining students' results on TCAP reading and language arts tests as well as the writing assessment (using three-year averages).

When a school or LEA fails AYP as determined above, a school or LEA will make AYP if the subgroup not making AYP reduces the number of below proficient students by 10% from the previous year's number and reaches performance objectives for at least one of the other indicators as identified below:

- a. High School – annual graduation rate; and,
- b. Elementary and middle – attendance.

The State will not be able to employ the Safe Harbor provision above until Spring 2004 as that will be the first year of the implementation of its standards-based assessments. In addition, by Spring 2004 the State will be able to disaggregate at the school level both graduation and attendance rates. No new schools will be identified for school improvement based on Spring 2003 data so Safe Harbor calculations are not crucial until Spring 2004.

AYP determination for schools that cross both levels, elementary-middle and high school, will be at both levels. Sanctions and rewards will be applied only to the level(s) affected.

Schools and districts will be able to meet AYP by:

- Using their three-year rolling averages (when available);
- Using their most current two-year averages; or,
- Using their most current year data.

In calculating AYP for student sub-populations, 45 or more students must be included in each student sub-population to assure high levels of reliability. As soon as the minimum number for a subgroup is attained, then ninety-five percent of students in each applicable student sub-group must be tested in order for the school to make AYP.

All students' scores will be used as an aggregate to determine the AYP of schools as a whole. All schools' scores will be used as an aggregate to determine the AYP of LEAs.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>3.2a What is the State's starting point for calculating Adequate Yearly Progress?</p>	<p>Using data from the 2001-2002 school year, the State established separate starting points in reading/language arts and mathematics for measuring the percentage of students meeting or exceeding the State's proficient level of academic achievement.</p> <p>Each starting point is based, at a minimum, on the higher of the following percentages of students at the proficient level: (1) the percentage in the State of proficient students in the lowest-achieving student subgroup; or, (2) the percentage of proficient students in a public school at the 20th percentile of the State's total enrollment among all schools ranked by the percentage of students at the proficient level.</p> <p>A State may use these procedures to establish separate starting points by grade span; however, the starting point must be the same for all like schools (e.g., one same starting point for all elementary schools, one same starting point for all middle schools...)</p>	<p>The State Accountability System uses a different method for calculating the starting point (or baseline data).</p>

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

AYP starting points will be determined in Summer 2003 by the higher of the two calculations described below:

1. Average TCAP proficiency percentages will be calculated for each school at each grade span in reading/language arts and math separately. Schools will be sorted by the required grade span and ranked from highest to lowest based on performance. Beginning with the lowest performing school and moving up, enrollments will be aggregated until 20 percent of the State's enrollment for that grade span level is captured. The score of the school at the 20th percentile of enrollment is the score that will be used for the starting point; or
2. The percentage of the lowest performing subgroup.

These AYP starting points will be determined by the test results from school year 2002-2003 for the standards-based assessments in reading/language arts, writing, and mathematics for grades 3, 5, and 8 for the elementary and middle school level.

These AYP starting points will be determined by the test results from school year 2002-2003 for the Gateway English, mathematics, and 11th grade writing assessments for the high school level.

Two grade spans will be determined: elementary/middle and high school.

These reading/language arts and math starting points will be applied to determine whether AYP has been attained for all schools and districts for school year 2003-2004.

For grades 3-8, the reading/language arts score will be determined by averaging the Reading/Language Arts Composite Proficiency Score with the Writing Proficiency score as follows:

- Grades 5 and 8 at the weight of 1 part Reading/Language Arts Composite Proficiency Score and .5 part Writing Proficiency Score; and,
- Grades 3, 4, 6, and 7 at the weight of 1 part Reading/Language Arts Composite Proficiency Score.

For high school, the reading/language arts scores will be determined by averaging the Gateway English Proficiency Score at the weight of 1 part and the 11th Grade Writing Proficiency Score at .5 part.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS
3.2b What are the State's annual measurable objectives for determining adequate yearly progress?	<p>State has annual measurable objectives that are consistent with a state's intermediate goals and that identify for each year a minimum percentage of students who must meet or exceed the proficient level of academic achievement on the State's academic assessments.</p> <p>The State's annual measurable objectives ensure that all students meet or exceed the State's proficient level of academic achievement within the timeline.</p> <p>The State's annual measurable objectives are the same throughout the State for each public school, each LEA, and each subgroup of students.</p>	<p>The State Accountability System uses another method for calculating annual measurable objectives.</p> <p>The State Accountability System does not include annual measurable objectives.</p>

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p> <p>Tennessee's accountability system will incorporate all AYP requirements including annual measurable objectives that will be applied to all public schools in the State. Annual measurable objectives and goals will be the same for the State, every LEA, every school, and all required subgroups of students. Intermediate goals and annual measurable objectives will be determined in Fall 2003. These will be established to ensure that all students are proficient in reading/language arts and math by 2013-2014.</p>		

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
3.2c What are the State's intermediate goals for determining adequate yearly progress?	<p>State has established intermediate goals that increase in equal increments over the period covered by the State timeline.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">•The first incremental increase takes effect not later than the 2004-2005 academic year.•Each following incremental increase occurs within three years.	<p>The State uses another method for calculating intermediate goals.</p> <p>The State does not include intermediate goals in its definition of adequate yearly progress.</p>

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p> <p>Intermediate AYP goals will be determined in Fall 2003. As required by NCLB, the first incremental increase will occur during the 2004-05 school year. Subsequent increases will occur in not more than 3 years after that point.</p>		

PRINCIPLE 4. State makes annual decisions about the achievement of all public schools and LEAs.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS
4.1 How does the State Accountability System make an annual determination of whether each public school and LEA in the State made AYP?	AYP decisions for each public school and LEA are made annually. ⁴	AYP decisions for public schools and LEAs are not made annually.

⁴ Decisions may be based upon several years of data and data may be averaged across grades within a public school [§1111(b)(2)(J)].

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p> <p>As required by both state and federal legislative requirements, AYP determinations will be made annually for each public school and school district in the State. To incorporate the requirements in the State's timeline waiver, the State will use the existing transitional accountability model for schools that are currently in some category of identification to determine their status based on Spring 2003 data. There are 132 schools, both Title I and non-Title I, identified in one of the State's categories. These schools will be notified of their new status by July in time for them to appeal the identification. Final determination of status will be made by the first day of school.</p> <p>The State will determine starting points, intermediate goals, and annual measurable objectives as required by NCLB for each level and each required content area in Fall 2003 and apply this formula to determine all the AYP status of all schools. All schools will be notified of whether or not they made AYP using the AYP model in Fall 2003.</p>		

PRINCIPLE 5. All public schools and LEAs are held accountable for the achievement of individual subgroups.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS
5.1 How does the definition of adequate yearly progress include all the required student subgroups?	<p>Identifies subgroups for defining adequate yearly progress: economically disadvantaged, major racial and ethnic groups, students with disabilities, and students with limited English proficiency.</p> <p>Provides definition and data source of subgroups for adequate yearly progress.</p>	State does not disaggregate data by each required student subgroup.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p> <p>The TCAP administration already collects the required subgroup data. The State will design processes to capture all the required subgroup data for the graduation rate. The subgroups will be defined as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Race/ethnicity – White, Hispanic, Black, Native American, Asian/Pacific Islander • Economically disadvantaged – Students on free or reduced lunch • Students with disabilities – Students with IEPs • Limited English Proficient – Students who are non-English language background and have not been reclassified as Fluent English proficient as defined by this definition in the State’s plan for Title VI compliance to the Office for Civil Rights <p><i>Fluent English proficient:</i> - non-English language background students who show no difficulty in regular classroom performance and meet one of the following criteria:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. upon initial enrollment in a Tennessee public school, scored Fluent English Proficient on all subsections of the state approved English Language Proficiency assessment; or, 2. initially qualified as limited English proficient based on the state approved English Language Proficiency assessment, received English as a Second Language services, and has now scored proficient or above for two (2) consecutive years on the state approved English Language Proficiency assessment; or, 3. demonstrated the ability to meet the State’s proficient or above proficient level of achievement on State assessment described in section 1111(b)(3) for reading and language arts. <p>These data will be used for the subgroup accountability purposes. The State will design a process in which the other required subgroup populations, students with disabilities, limited English proficient students, and economically disadvantaged students can be incorporated into the data collection for graduation rates.</p> <p>Links to Supporting Documentation: http://www.state.tn.us/education/accteslpart2.htm</p>		

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS
5.2 How are public schools and LEAs held accountable for the progress of student subgroups in the determination of adequate yearly progress?	Public schools and LEAs are held accountable for student subgroup achievement: economically disadvantaged, major ethnic and racial groups, students with disabilities, and limited English proficient students.	State does not include student subgroups in its State Accountability System.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS
------------------	-----------------------------------	---

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

State – All students aggregated across the state and all of the required subgroups must meet the annual performance objectives in reading/language arts and math at the two levels, elementary-middle and high school to make AYP.

LEA – Each LEA as a whole and all of its required subgroups must reach annual performance objectives in reading/language arts and math in order for the LEA to make AYP.

School – Each school as a whole and all of its required subgroups must reach annual performance objectives in reading and math in order for the school to make AYP. Schools that cross both levels will be assessed for AYP status based on both levels.

The State will only include scores from students who were continuously enrolled in the school or LEA for a full academic year. The State will only include subgroup populations in accountability and reporting decisions that have met the minimum number of students. The State will ensure that 95% of all students and 95% of all subgroups (having met the minimum number of students) have participated in the assessment for a school or LEA as a requirement of AYP. The State will apply the 1% flexibility provision at both the district and state level for the use of alternative assessment for students with disabilities held to alternative standards.

The State will determine whether or not the LEA or the school meets the “Safe Harbor” provision of NCLB when the State determines that a subgroup has failed AYP.

CRITICAL	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS
5.3 How are students with disabilities included in the State's definition of adequate yearly progress?	<p>All students with disabilities participate in statewide assessments: general assessments with or without accommodations or an alternate assessment based on grade level standards for the grade in which students are enrolled.</p> <p>State demonstrates that students with disabilities are fully included in the State Accountability System.</p>	<p>The State Accountability System or State policy excludes students with disabilities from participating in the statewide assessments.</p> <p>State cannot demonstrate that alternate assessments measure grade-level standards for the grade in which students are enrolled.</p>

CRITICAL	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
----------	--------------------------------------	---

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

All students with disabilities participate in the TCAP with appropriate accommodations or the TCAP –Alternate.

All TCAP and TCAP-Alt. results for students with disabilities are included as part of the AYP equation.

The TCAP-Alt. will be reported in the three levels used by the State:

Below proficient;

Proficient; and,

Advanced.

The scores for students with disabilities who take the alternate assessment will be included in the assessment data in the accountability system within the parameters defined by federal statute and regulations. The State will apply the 1% flexibility provision at both the district and state level for the use of alternative assessment for students with disabilities held to alternative standards.

Links to Supporting Evidence:

<http://www.state.tn.us/education/speced/seassessment.htm>

Tennessee Department of Education

Submitted

6/23/2003 11:29 AM

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS
5.4 How are students with limited English proficiency included in the State's definition of adequate yearly progress?	<p>All LEP students participate in statewide assessments: general assessments with or without accommodations or a native language version of the general assessment based on grade level standards.</p> <p>State demonstrates that LEP students are fully included in the State Accountability System.</p>	<p>LEP students are not fully included in the State Accountability System.</p>

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p> <p>To ensure compliance with NCLB, all limited English proficient (LEP) students will be included in TCAP administration. The state has developed an inclusion policy and a list of approved accommodations for LEP students.</p> <p>To provide for more reliable and valid assessment of LEP students' content knowledge, the State has formed a consortium with three other states, under the auspices of AccountabilityWorks and the Education Testing Service, and been awarded an Enhanced Assessment Grant to develop an alternate assessment English language instrument which will be aligned with State content standards. This test will report students in the same State categories of proficiency: below proficient, proficient, and advanced. These scores will be incorporated into the accountability system. LEP students will be able to continue to take the alternate assessment until they meet the fluent English proficient status on the State's adopted English language proficiency test for two consecutive years.</p> <p>In addition, the Department will develop and implement an alternative assessment for LEP students to measure their content knowledge in math. Both alternative assessments, the one for reading/language arts and math, will be aligned with the State's content standards and be implemented in school year 2004-2005. The State will continue to require all LEP students to participate in the regular TCAP program with allowable accommodations until the alternative assessments are implemented.</p> <p>Links to Supporting Documentation:</p> <p>http://www.state.tn.us/education/acctesl.htm</p>		

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>5.5 What is the State's definition of the minimum number of students in a subgroup required for reporting purposes? For accountability purposes?</p>	<p>State defines the number of students required in a subgroup for reporting and accountability purposes, and applies this definition consistently across the State.⁵</p> <p>Definition of subgroup will result in data that are statistically reliable.</p>	<p>State does not define the required number of students in a subgroup for reporting and accountability purposes.</p> <p>Definition is not applied consistently across the State.</p> <p>Definition does not result in data that are statistically reliable.</p>

⁵ The minimum number is not required to be the same for reporting and accountability.

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

The minimum size of subgroups will vary based on the purposes of the calculation. The purposes for adopting a minimum subgroup size are for reporting results and calculating accountability for results.

Reporting Results

The minimum number of students in a group required for TCAP reporting is an annual minimum n-count of 10.

Calculating Accountability for Results

For the purpose of reporting AYP, the minimum number of students in all subgroups will be an annual n-count of 45. This value will provide an acceptable balance between the requirement for statistical reliability in the AYP calculations and holding schools accountable for the maximum number of students. If a school or LEA meets or exceeds the minimum number of students in a required subgroup and meets the 95% participation rate requirement, then that school or LEA must meet annual performance objectives set by the State.

Impact analyses conducted in Tennessee using subgroup population data indicate that the selection of a required minimum n-count of 45 does not adversely impact the percent of inclusion of any subgroup population. Tennessee will be using n-counts generated from two grade spans; K – 8, and 9 – 12. Distribution of the total student population as well subgroups designated for reporting by NCLB indicate the following impact of 45 as a minimum n-count:

Classification	Total # schools	Total Number of Students	Average # of students per school	# of schools meeting n-count	# of students reported based upon n-count
All students	1306	421,648	323	1273	420,951
White	1270	299,655	236	1122	297,441
Black	1129	107,747	95	498	99,769
Asian	735	5,005	7	17	977
Hispanic	997	8,025	8	17	1162
Native American	536	1,277	2	0	0
Low income	1306	184,431	141	1114	179,628
Special Needs	1309	51,827	40	426	31,418
Limited Eng. Prof.	452	2,614	6	6	342

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS
5.6 How does the State Accountability System protect the privacy of students when reporting results and when determining AYP?	Definition does not reveal personally identifiable information. ⁶	Definition reveals personally identifiable information.

⁶ The Family Education Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) prohibits an LEA that receives Federal funds from releasing, without the prior written consent of a student's parents, any personally identifiable information contained in a student's education record.

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

The minimum number of students in a LEA or school group required for reporting results, but not for determining AYP or participation rates, will be 10. Regardless of the n-count, under no circumstances will the data reported result in the identification of individual student performance, i.e., the reporting of 0% proficient. Criteria established for necessary AYP and/or participation rate n-counts of 45 were determined based upon rationale presented in 5.5.

When all students in a subgroup perform at the same level (for example, all are not proficient or all are proficient), then Tennessee will report the data as <5% of the particular subgroup was not proficient on the particular measure or conversely that >95% of the students were proficient on the particular measure.

PRINCIPLE 6. State definition of AYP is based primarily on the State's academic assessments.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS
6.1 How is the State's definition of adequate yearly progress based primarily on academic assessments?	Formula for AYP shows that decisions are based primarily on assessments. ⁷ Plan clearly identifies which assessments are included in accountability.	Formula for AYP shows that decisions are based primarily on non-academic indicators or indicators other than the State assessments.

⁷ State Assessment System will be reviewed by the Standards and Assessments Peer Review Team.
Tennessee Department of Education
Submitted
6/23/2003 11:29 AM

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p> <p>The State's definition of AYP includes primarily academic indicators:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. For grades 3-8: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reading/language arts and math results; and, • Attendance. 2. For high school; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • English/writing assessment results and Gateway math; and, • Annual graduation rate. <p>Reading/language arts in grades 3-8 includes the standards-based assessment and the performance-based writing assessment.</p> <p>Reading/language arts in high school includes the standards-based Gateway English assessment and the 11th grade performance based writing assessment.</p>		

PRINCIPLE 7. State definition of AYP includes graduation rates for public High schools and an additional indicator selected by the State for public Middle and public Elementary schools (such as attendance rates).

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
7.1 What is the State definition for the public high school graduation rate?	<p>State definition of graduation rate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Calculates the percentage of students, measured from the beginning of the school year, who graduate from public high school with a regular diploma (not including a GED or any other diploma not fully aligned with the state's academic standards) in the standard number of years; or, Uses another more accurate definition that has been approved by the Secretary; and Must avoid counting a dropout as a transfer. <p>Graduation rate is included (in the aggregate) for AYP, and disaggregated (as necessary) for use when applying the exception clause⁸ to make AYP.</p>	State definition of public high school graduation rate does not meet these criteria.

⁸ See USC 6311(b)(2)(I)(i), and 34 C.F.R. 200.20(b)

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

Tennessee's definition of graduation rate includes only those students who receive diplomas within the standard number of years including summer school terms. The standard number of years is defined as 4 years plus any summer school terms including the summer school term after 12th grade. The Department does not count transfers as drop outs and includes specific information in the Attendance Manual to local educational agencies about this. The Department will utilize one of the NCES recommended models to calculate the graduation rate.

Tennessee has a mandatory attendance software package which is used for calculating financial information based on average daily attendance as well as average daily membership. In this way, students are assigned student numbers and are coded as withdrawing, transferring, and dropouts. The system is precise and monitored by state personnel as the per pupil expenditure follows the student from system to system. Each student is tracked from school to school and system to system with his identifying number for the entire state system. This process guarantees that no student who has dropped out of school will be counted as a transfer or in any calculation of the Graduation Rate.

The State will calculate graduation rates in a uniform manner for all schools and school districts. The graduation rate will not include students who obtain a GED, a special education diploma, or certificate of attendance. The graduation rate will be a cumulative or longitudinal rate that will consider the number of students who actually graduate as a percent of those who were in membership and could have graduated over a 4-year period from grade 9 through 12 including summer term attendance. The number of graduates will be divided by the sum of graduates plus dropouts + completers over 4 years. The denominator for this rate will be: (Grads + 12th grade dropouts from current year + completers + 11th grade dropouts one year previously + 10th grade dropouts two years previously + 9th grade dropouts three years previously).

The State has the capacity to disaggregate this information for race/ethnicity presently. The State will establish a process for determining the graduation rate for the other three required subgroups this year. The State has the ability to calculate graduation rate at the school level disaggregated by race/ethnicity based on school year 2001-2002. The Department, with the approval of the State Board, will set its intermediate goals based on these calculations. The Department will create a cross-walk setting one-year, two-year, and three-year graduation rates that will be equivalent to our State Board adopted four-year graduation rate goals.

For the other three required subgroups, the State will begin to collect the data at the school level for school year 2003-2004 and determine a 12th grade graduation rate for those three groups and use the cross-walk equivalent for reporting and safe harbor provisions.

Links to Supporting Evidence:

<http://www.tennessee.gov/education/acctattendance.htm>

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS
7.2 What is the State's additional academic indicator for public elementary schools for the definition of AYP? For public middle schools for the definition of AYP?	<p>State defines the additional academic indicators, e.g., additional State or locally administered assessments not included in the State assessment system, grade-to-grade retention rates or attendance rates.⁹</p> <p>An additional academic indicator is included (in the aggregate) for AYP, and disaggregated (as necessary) for use when applying the exception clause to make AYP.</p>	State has not defined an additional academic indicator for elementary and middle schools.

⁹ NCLB only lists these indicators as examples.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p> <p>The only indicator at the elementary and middle school levels will be attendance.</p> <p>When employing the “safe harbor” provision, the performance of individual subgroups of students will have to meet or exceed the state performance objective set for the indicator.</p> <p>The State will collect attendance rate at the elementary and middle school levels disaggregated by the required subgroups for the first time in Spring 2004. In Spring 2003, the State will collect the attendance rate for all students at the school level and report it and the AYP determination based on this rate. Because the State cannot implement Safe Harbor provisions until Spring 2004 since Spring 2003 is the first year of the implementation of its standards-based assessments, disaggregated attendance rate data will not be needed in Spring 2003.</p>		

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS
7.3 Are the State's academic indicators valid and reliable?	State has defined academic indicators that are valid and reliable. State has defined academic indicators that are consistent with nationally recognized standards, if any.	State has an academic indicator that is not valid and reliable. State has an academic indicator that is not consistent with nationally recognized standards. State has an academic indicator that is not consistent within grade levels.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p> <p>The State has collected and analyzed drop-out and attendance data for many years with increased accuracy. As the State establishes its system for collecting and analyzing data for the graduation rate, it will ensure that the process will meet a strict test for reliability and validity. The other indicator for elementary/middle school, attendance, will meet the strict tests of reliability and validity required through our data collection system.</p>		

PRINCIPLE 8. AYP is based on reading/language arts and mathematics achievement objectives.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
8.1 Does the state measure achievement in reading/language arts and mathematics separately for determining AYP?	<p>State AYP determination for student subgroups, public schools and LEAs separately measures reading/language arts and mathematics.¹⁰</p> <p>AYP is a separate calculation for reading/language arts and mathematics for each group, public school, and LEA.</p>	State AYP determination for student subgroups, public schools and LEAs averages or combines achievement across reading/language arts and mathematics.

¹⁰ If the state has more than one assessment to cover its language arts standards, the State must create a method for including scores from all the relevant assessments.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS A separate determination will be made annually in reading/language arts and math. An LEA or school must reach performance objectives in both content areas in order to make AYP.		

PRINCIPLE 9. State Accountability System is statistically valid and reliable.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS
9.1 How do AYP determinations meet the State's standard for acceptable reliability?	<p>State has defined a method for determining an acceptable level of reliability (decision consistency) for AYP decisions.</p> <p>State provides evidence that decision consistency is (1) within the range deemed acceptable to the State, and (2) meets professional standards and practice.</p> <p>State publicly reports the estimate of decision consistency, and incorporates it appropriately into accountability decisions.</p> <p>State updates analysis and reporting of decision consistency at appropriate intervals.</p>	<p>State does not have an acceptable method for determining reliability (decision consistency) of accountability decisions, e.g., it reports only reliability coefficients for its assessments.</p> <p>State has parameters for acceptable reliability; however, the actual reliability (decision consistency) falls outside those parameters.</p> <p>State's evidence regarding accountability reliability (decision consistency) is not updated.</p>

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p> <p>The criterion referenced assessments utilized to underpin the accountability process specified in NCLB have been developed specifically to measure student proficiency levels relative to the state curriculum framework. The alignment of the assessment items comprising the annual tests are subject to state approval before each administration. This process provides content validity.</p> <p>Adequate Yearly Progress necessary to reach 100% by the 2013-2014 school year will be computed utilizing the percentages of student subgroups in Tennessee whose participation rates equal or exceed 95% and are based upon success in the attainment of proficiency standards objectively established by the collective deliberation of experts and practitioners in the appropriate curricular areas. A scientifically based on going analysis of performance and progress will inform the state of the appropriateness of both the utilization of the assessment and the instruction relative to the approved curricular frameworks. These analyses should provide construct validity.</p> <p>The State will study the decisions that have been made on AYP determinations on an annual basis. The State will review the validity and reliability of those determinations and make adjustments based on this review.</p>		

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS
9.2 What is the State's process for making valid AYP determinations?	State has established a process for public schools and LEAs to appeal an accountability decision.	State does not have a system for handling appeals of accountability decisions.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p> <p>Assessments are reviewed annually before administration to assure alignment with state content standards. Sample results are analyzed to determine that assessment scales validly reflect performance for students at each 5th percentile level of performance (i.e., 5th, 10th, ...80th...).</p> <p>Any school may appeal to the district and districts to the state decisions made regarding AYP. In the case of AYP decisions regarding schools, the LEA must consider the appeal for transmission to the State. If the LEA agrees with the appeal and submits it to the State, the State will consider the appeal. The decision will be made and conveyed to the school within the 30 days timeframe. Under State law, the State is responsible for the final determination of schools in improvement categories.</p> <p>Similarly, if a district appeals a decision regarding AYP, the State must make a final determination within 30 days of the date of the appeal.</p> <p>The State will provide technical assistance to schools and LEAs with the appeals process.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Tennessee Department of Education Submitted 6/23/2003 11:29 AM</p>		

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS
9.3 How has the State planned for incorporating into its definition of AYP anticipated changes in assessments?	<p>State has a plan to maintain continuity in AYP decisions necessary for validity through planned assessment changes, and other changes necessary to comply fully with NCLB.¹¹</p> <p>State has a plan for including new public schools in the State Accountability System.</p> <p>State has a plan for periodically reviewing its State Accountability System, so that unforeseen changes can be quickly addressed.</p>	<p>State's transition plan interrupts annual determination of AYP.</p> <p>State does not have a plan for handling changes: e.g., to its assessment system, or the addition of new public schools.</p>

¹¹ Several events may occur which necessitate such a plan. For example, (1) the State may need to include additional assessments in grades 3-8 by 2005-2006; (2) the State may revise content and/or academic achievement standards; (3) the State may need to recalculate the starting point with the addition of new assessments; or (4) the State may need to incorporate the graduation rate or other indicators into its State Accountability System. These events may require new calculations of validity and reliability.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p> <p>Tennessee is currently reviewing proposals as a result of its Request for Proposal for a standards-based assessment system in grades 3-8 in reading/language arts, math, science, and social studies. The State will establish starting points for reading/language arts and math for elementary/middle school level will be determined by the results of the grades 3, 5, and 8 in Summer 2003. The starting point for science will be established in Summer 2004.</p> <p>Tennessee will annually review how AYP decisions are applied regarding validity and reliability to determine any revisions necessary in its accountability system</p> <p>Link to Supporting Documentation: http://www.state.tn.us/education/tsrfpinfo.htm</p>		

PRINCIPLE 10. In order for a public school or LEA to make AYP, the State ensures that it assessed at least 95% of the students enrolled in each subgroup.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS
10.1 What is the State's method for calculating participation rates in the State assessments for use in AYP determinations?	<p>State has a procedure to determine the number of absent or untested students (by subgroup and aggregate).</p> <p>State has a procedure to determine the denominator (total enrollment) for the 95% calculation (by subgroup and aggregate).</p> <p>Public schools and LEAs are held accountable for reaching the 95% assessed goal.</p>	<p>The state does not have a procedure for determining the rate of students participating in statewide assessments.</p> <p>Public schools and LEAs are not held accountable for testing at least 95% of their students.</p>

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p> <p>Tennessee will determine participation rates for the first time in Spring 2003. Only schools and LEAs that meet the 95% participation rate for all students and each subgroup will meet AYP requirements unless the size of the subgroup does not meet the minimum number set for participation rate purposes (45).</p> <p>Schools will be responsible for completing answer sheets for any student enrolled in grades and subjects included in the assessment program. The participation rate for all students and required subgroups will be determined by the number of students participating in the assessment divided by the number of students enrolled (as indicated by the number of answer sheets). These data will be randomly audited for accuracy by the Division of Internal Audit.</p>		

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS
10.2 What is the State's policy for determining when the 95% assessed requirement should be applied?	State has a policy that implements the regulation regarding the use of 95% allowance when the group is statistically significant according to State rules.	State does not have a procedure for making this determination.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS		
<p>The State will base its 95% calculation upon the student membership documentation provided by each LEA and school during testing. Schools and LEAs in which fewer than 95% of any subgroup fails to participate in the state assessment will fail AYP, unless the size of the subgroup does not meet the minimum number set for accountability purposes (i.e. 45). These data will be randomly audited for accuracy by the Division of Internal Audit.</p>		

Appendix A**Required Data Elements for State Report Card****1111(h)(1)(C)**

1. Information, in the aggregate, on student achievement at each proficiency level on the State academic assessments (disaggregated by race, ethnicity, gender, disability status, migrant status, English proficiency, and status as economically disadvantaged, except that such disaggregation shall not be required in a case in which the number of students in a category is insufficient to yield statistically reliable information or the results would reveal personally identifiable information about an individual student.
2. Information that provides a comparison between the actual achievement levels of each student subgroup and the State's annual measurable objectives for each such group of students on each of the academic assessments.
3. The percentage of students not tested (disaggregated by the student subgroups), except that such disaggregation shall not be required in a case in which the number of students in a category is insufficient to yield statistically reliable information or the results would reveal personally identifiable information about an individual student.
4. The most recent 2-year trend in student achievement in each subject area, and for each grade level, for the required assessments.
5. Aggregate information on any other indicators used by the State to determine the adequate yearly progress of students in achieving State academic achievement standards disaggregated by student subgroups.
6. Graduation rates for secondary school students disaggregated by student subgroups.
7. Information on the performance of local educational agencies in the State regarding making adequate yearly progress, including the number and names of each school identified for school improvement under section 1116.
8. The professional qualifications of teachers in the State, the percentage of such teachers teaching with emergency or provisional credentials, and the percentage of classes in the State not taught by highly qualified teachers, in the aggregate and disaggregated by high-poverty compared to low-poverty schools which (for this purpose) means schools in the top quartile of poverty and the bottom quartile of poverty in the State.

Submitted
6/23/2003 11:29 AM

Attachment A
Tennessee Accountability Chart

Heads Up	School Improvement & School Improvement-Improving SI-1	Notice & Notice-Improving SI-2	Probation & Probation-Improving Corrective Action-1	Corrective Action & Corrective Action-Improving Restructuring	Alternative Governance Alternative Governance
After First Year of Not Making Adequate Progress (Beginning of Year 2)	After Second Year of Not Making Adequate Progress (Beginning of Year 3)	After Third Year of Not Making Adequate Progress (Beginning of Year 4)	After Fourth Year of Not Making Adequate Progress (Beginning of Year 5)	After Fifth Year of Not Making Adequate Progress (Beginning of Year 6)	After Sixth Year of Not Making Adequate Progress (Beginning of Year 7)
Note: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ♦ Title I and non-Title I schools implement sanctions under TCA 49-1-602 ♦ Only Title I schools implement sanctions under NCLB 	TCA-49-1-602 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ♦ (State will publicly identify all schools in need of improvement, Title I and non-Title I, that are at risk of being placed on notice. State sanctions do not apply until a school is placed on notice) NCLB <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ♦ Public Notification and Dissemination ♦ Public School Choice ♦ Revise SIP (including 10% of funding used for professional development each year school identified) ♦ Plan with Outside Expert ♦ Technical Assistance ♦ Peer Review of SIP 	TCA-49-1-602 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ♦ Joint Study of School System (SDE & Comptroller) ♦ SDE Approval of state discretionary grants to schools ♦ SDE provides technical assistance through outside expert ♦ Parent Notification ♦ Revision of SIP NCLB <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ♦ Public Notification and Dissemination ♦ Public School Choice ♦ Supplemental Services ♦ Technical Assistance 	TCA-49-1-602 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ♦ SDE Approve School System's Allocation of Resources to School ♦ SDE Appoint Local Review Committee to Approve & Monitor SIP ♦ Parent Notification ♦ Performance Contract for Principal ♦ Provision of Remediation/Supplemental Services ♦ Public School Choice ♦ Incorporate Joint Study Findings in SIP NCLB <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ♦ Public Notification and Dissemination ♦ Public School Choice ♦ Supplemental Services ♦ Technical Assistance ♦ Implement Corrective Action (at least 1) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ♦ Replace staff ♦ New curriculum ♦ Significantly decrease management authority at the school ♦ Appoint outside expert ♦ Reorganize internal organization 	TCA-49-1-602 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ♦ SDE Approves School System's Allocation of Financial Resources to School ♦ SDE Approves Allocation of Personnel Resources of School ♦ SDE Presents Options for School to Plan for Alternative Governance/LEA Develops Plan for Alternative Governance (Contract with IHE, State Takeover, Charter School) ♦ Parent Notification ♦ Performance Contract for Principals ♦ Remediation/Supplemental Services ♦ Public School Choice NCLB <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ♦ Public Notification and Dissemination ♦ Public School Choice ♦ Supplemental Services ♦ Technical Assistance ♦ Continue to Implement Corrective Action ♦ Prepare a Plan and Make Necessary Arrangements for Alternative Governance (Charter School, Replace Staff, Contract for Private Management, Other Major Restructure) 	TCA-49-1-602 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ♦ The Commissioner assumes any and all powers of governance of the school NCLB <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ♦ Prompt Notification of Affected Teachers & Parents ♦ Technical Assistance ♦ Implement Alternative Governance <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ♦ Reopen as public charter school ♦ Replace all or most of relevant school staff ♦ Contract with a private management company ♦ State takeover ♦ Any other major restructuring

Tennessee Department of Education
Submitted
6/23/2003 11:29 AM

Contact for more information:

Julie P. McCargar, Director
Federal Programs
Tennessee Department of Education
5th Floor-Andrew Johnson Tower
710 James Robertson Parkway
Nashville, Tennessee 37243

Phone: (615) 532-6297
Fax: (615) 532-8536
E-mail: Julie.McCargar@state.tn.us